

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 16-19 and 22 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice. Enclosed herewith is PTO Credit Card payment form in the amount of \$86.00 in payment of the fee for the added claims. Please charge any other fees for entry of this Amendment to our Deposit account 16-1844.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 7 would be allowable if placed in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claim 7 to place the claim in independent form. Claim 7 is thus now allowable.

The Examiner has objected to applicant's claims 3 and 5 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's claims 3 and 5 each recite that "the plurality of processes include at least one of the processes of program record reservation, listening/viewing reservation, program detailed information display, and program data reproduction." Thus, the claim is stating that there are at least two processes (plurality of processes) and that the at least two processes include at least one of a number of specific process (program record reservation, listening/viewing reservation, program detailed information display, or program data reproduction). Moreover, use of the word include means that the plurality of processes have other processes in addition to the at least one of the specific processes.

The language of each of claims 3 and 5 thus does, in fact, further limit the parent claim by requiring that at least one of the plurality of processes, each of which could be any process, now be a specific process, and by using the word include which means that the plurality of

processes has other processes in addition to the at least one of the specific processes.

Accordingly applicant's claims 3 and 5 are believed to be in conformity with the provisions of 37 CFR § 1.75(c).

The Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 1-3, 10, 15-16, 19-20 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the Son, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0035647) publication. The Examiner has also rejected applicant's claims 4-6, 8, 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Son, et al. publication in view of the Wehmeyer, et al. (U.S. 5,867,226) patent. Claims 9, 11-4 and 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Son, et al. publication in view of the Wehmeyer, et al. patent in further view of the Sullivan (U.S. 6,591,421) patent.

Applicant has amended applicant's claims and with respect to such claims, as amended, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claims 1, 16-19 and 22 have been amended to better define applicant's invention. Looking at claim 1 as a representative claim, this claim now recites a signal processing apparatus in which a processing means executes a plurality of processes and an input means inputs program data and program information of the program data. Assigning means automatically assigns each program with a unique code corresponding to the process to be executed to the program and control means controls the processing means to execute the plurality of processes in accordance with the code assigned by the assigning means. Applicant's independent claims 16-19 and 22 have been similarly amended.

As above set forth, according to the present invention, since the codes corresponding to the plural processes are automatically assigned to the received program on the user side, the user can easily perform the plural processes such as the program reservation and the like even if

the program reservation code and the like are not delivered from the broadcasting station. Additionally, since the code is automatically assigned to the received program, the number of digits of the code can be fewer, whereby it is possible to reduce the input errors. Such constructions are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record.

More particularly, as the Examiner has argued the Son, et al. publication discloses a system in which if "a user wishes to watch a predetermined broadcasting program such as a movie, sports program, etc., but cannot watch the program due to a predetermined event, the user may use a function for reserving a program record by storing a code of the program using a predetermined code determined for every broadcasted program' (Paragraph 0006)." The subsequent paragraph in the Son, et al. publication makes it clear that the "broadcasting station outputs a program reserving code which corresponds to the amount of one week for a reserved program record function when transmitting a broadcasting signal" (emphasis added) and that "a user having a . . . VCR and a television set can reserve a program by selecting the predetermined code for the desired broadcasting program to be recorded in advance by one week"(Paragraph 0007).

Thus, in the Son, et al. publication, the program reserving codes are carried by the broadcasted signals. Accordingly there is nothing taught or suggested in the patent as to on a signal processing apparatus side, such as a receiver or the like, of inputting program data and program information of the program data and then automatically assigning each program with a unique code corresponding to the process to be executed to the program. As previously stated, in the Son, et al. publication the broadcasted signals carry the codes and the none of the passages of the publication cited by the Examiner, or otherwise, state anything as to automatically assigning codes on the receiver side.

Applicant's amended independent claims 1, 16-19 and 22, and their respective dependent claims, all of which recite such feature, in one form or another, thus patentably distinguish over the Son, et al. publication. The other references cited by the Examiner, i.e., the Wehmeyer, et al. and Sullivan patents, add nothing to the Son, et al. publication to change this conclusion.


In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that an interview would expedite consideration of this Amendment or of the application, a request is made that the Examiner telephone applicant's counsel at (212) 682-9640.

Dated: February 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

ROBIN BLECKER & DALEY
330 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017
T (212) 682-9640


John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,359
Attorney of Record